DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 962 IR 054 522

AUTHOR Maxwell, James D.
TITLE A Summary of the Online Public Access Catalog Merger between the Library of the Franklin University and the Columbus Ohio Metropolitan Library and an Analysis of the Intralibrary Loan Relationship.
PUB DATE Jul 92
NOTE 40p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Information; *College Libraries; Higher Education; *Interlibrary Loans; Library Catalogs; *Library Cooperation; Library Services; *Mergers; *Online Catalogs; *Public Libraries; Shared Library Resources; Technological Advancement; Union Catalogs; Universities
IDENTIFIERS Columbus Public Library OH; Franklin University OH

ABSTRACT

Cooperation between different types of libraries to increase ease of patron access was not capable of great strides until the technological advances of the mid-1980s. Writers in the field are reporting increased pockets of activity, but also say that traditional ideas, such as pride of ownership or fear of future results from fixed commitments, are still deterring many possible cooperative efforts. Steps leading to the merging of the cataloged items to an online system by an academic library and a public library are summarized. This cooperative effort by the Franklin University Library in Columbus (Ohio) and the Columbus Metropolitan Library (Ohio) resulted in the formation of a cooperative network that has ignored the myths and overcome the barriers. This paper tracks the results of intralibrary loan transactions for parts of two trimesters (4 months in total) to determine the quantity and classifications of materials being utilized. Findings reveal that the academic library was loaning a greater number of books into the system than in-house patrons were borrowing from the public library collection, to the extent of almost seven-to-one. The director of the Franklin library is not displeased to see the materials being loaned, reasoning that it is rewarding to see the materials being used and that this provides excellent public relations. Four figures illustrate study findings. (Contains 22 references.) (SLD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IR

ED355962

# A SUMMARY OF THE ONLINE PUBLIC ACCESS CATALOG MERGER BETWEEN THE LIBRARY OF THE FRANKLIN UNIVERSITY AND THE COLUMBUS OHIO METROPOLITAN LIBRARY AND AN ANALYSIS OF THE INTRALIBRARY LOAN RELATIONSHIP

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

James D. Maxwell

July, 1992

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James D. Maxwell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1205522



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**ABSTRACT**

Cooperation between different types of libraries to increase ease of patron access was not capable of great strides until the technology advances of the mid-1980s. Writers in the field are reporting increased pockets of activity but also say that traditional ideas, such as pride of ownership or fear of future results from fixed commitments, are still deterring many possible cooperative efforts. This descriptive study summarizes the steps leading to the merging of the cataloged items to an online system by an academic and a public library. It also tracks the results of the intralibrary loan transactions for parts of two trimesters to determine the quantity and classifications of materials being utilized. Findings of the study reveal that the academic library was loaning a greater number of books into the system than "in-house" patrons were borrowing from the public library collection, to the extent of almost seven-to-one.

Master's Research Paper by

James D. Maxwell

B.S., Ohio State University, 1961

M.B.A., Ohio State University, 1963

M.L.S., Kent State University, August, 1992

Approved by

Adviser Lois Buttlar Date 7-14-92

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval Page.....ii

Table of Contents.....iii

List of Figures.....iv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

Background of the Study.....2

Purpose of the Study.....5

Limitations of the Study.....8

Definitions of Terms.....8

II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....10

III. METHODOLOGY.....18

IV. DATA ANALYSIS.....21

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....30

Bibliography.....32

## LIST OF FIGURES


Figure — Page

1. Numerical summary and ratios of the total number of books borrowed and loaned over a four-month period in the Franklin University study in 1991.....21

2. Summary totals of all books loaned and borrowed and the corresponding "business" percentage.....22

3. Summary and comparison of books being charged out at the Franklin circulation desk and those loaned to CML.....23

4. Totals by Dewey classification.....27

## CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

Recent years in the field of library and information science have witnessed a change in emphasis from ownership of materials to access to them.[1], [2] This is evidenced by the fact that a recently published (1990) book of essays sponsored by the American Library Association contains a chapter with impassioned statements regarding the increasing importance of access and calling for more research on the subject.[3] This had been preceeded by another ALA-published book, 1986, which had decried the failure of the methods being used by public libraries to provide access and to share resources.[4]

Additionally, while bodies such as the Council on Library Resources, Inc. continue to promote the need for analysis of

---

[1]Patricia Senn Breivik and E. Gordon Gee. Information Literacy: Revolution in the Library, (New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan Publishing, 1990), 135.

[2]Jo Bell Whitlatch, "Access Services," chap. in Academic Libraries: Research Perspectives, ed. Mary Jo Lynch and Arthur Young (Chicago: American Library Association, 1990), 67.

[3]Ibid., 67-99.

[4]Thomas H. Ballard, The Failure of Resource Sharing in Public Libraries and Alternative Strategies for Service, (Chicago: American Library Association, 1986), 49.

methods of cooperation and access[5] one of the previously cited publications indicates that "barriers" and "myths" which deter or confuse the reasons for cooperation are still very much in evidence.[6]

The recent merging of cataloged materials into one online-public-access catalog and the joint utilization of one circulation system by the Franklin University Library with the Columbus Metropolitan Library (CML), represents the formation of a cooperative network which has ignored the myths and overcome the barriers.

## Background of the Study

Franklin University is a private, four-year undergraduate institution. Franklin's campus is in the center of downtown Columbus, Ohio and the Franklin Library (FL) is located three city blocks from the Main location of the CML.

While Franklin is a private university, it has always been a policy of the library to be open to the general public and to central Ohio businesses.

The academic thrusts of the Franklin Univesity are:

1. B.S. in Business (various majors)

---

[5]Council on Library Resources, Annual Report (Washington: Council on Library Resources), report for 1985, 13; report for 1989, 17-18; report for 1990, 27-28.

[6]Breivik and Gee, Information Literacy, 137-41.

2. B.S. in Engineering Technology

3. Conversion to Bachelor of Science in Nursing from an RN diploma.

All of Franklin's students commute. Approximately 2,800 are full-time students and 1,200 are part-time.

The FL owns cataloged books in all sections of the DEWEY system and several thousand biographies in its total book collection of about 70,000 titles. FL has no fiction or juvenile holdings and the only videos are a limited number of remedial math and algebra tapes. These tapes are on the online system. Franklin's serial collection is not on the system and serials are not permitted to circulate.

The CML has approximately 1.8 million cataloged items including books, sheet music, maps, video and audio tapes, and compact disks. All of these can be searched and selected for intralibrary loan by patrons at any location, including the Franklin Library. In addition to the Main location, the CML system has twenty branch locations. The year of 1991 saw the completion of a major renovation and addition at the Main location. During 1991, CML had a total circulation of 8.4 million items, placing it as tenth in the United States for circulation volume.[7]

Agreement to merge both catalogs onto one computer access system was informally agreed to as early as 1983, but hardware

---

[7]Columbus Metropolitan Library. 1991 Annual Report (Columbus, Ohio: 1991), 1.

problems caused postponement until September of 1989.[8] The FL began operating on the CML system while continuing to link books to the CML records. The process was completed by December, 1990. Funding for the project was accomplished by a grant from The Columbus Foundation and several matching gifts from local corporations.[9]

A review of the original proposal statements and unpublished correspondence indicates the following motivations for the online catalog cooperation:

1. Greater ease of patron access to the individual collections of each library[10]
2. A further reinforcement of Franklin's library policy of public access to its private collection, particularly by the business community. Mention was also made of Franklin's extensive Social Sciences collection as well as its business collection.[11]

---

[8]Allyn Ehrhart, to Dr. Tullia Hamilton, 6 December 1990, unpublished letter regarding the formation of the FL/CML relationship.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Larry Black, Director of the CML, to Allyn Ehrhart, Director at FL, 29 April 1983.

[11]Frederick J. Bunte, President of Franklin University, to Ms Tullia Hamilton, Program Director of the Columbus Foundation, 4 May, 1983.

3. A savings in future material acquisition costs for both organizations.[12]

4. To provide the benefits of an automated circulation system [and catalog] to the Franklin University at far less expense than purchasing an independent system.[13]

Because all of the FL collection has been available on the now combined online-public-access catalog since December, 1990, it was determined that usage should now be measured, and a determination as to the effect on patron service.

## Purpose of the Study

How do libraries that are linked, but with different missions, goals and users interact with each other? In particular, what patterns of borrowing and lending can be expected between an academic and a public library when they are linked in one system?

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the intralibrary loan activity between the Franklin University Library (FL) and the Columbus Metropolitan Library (CML).

Further justification of the study may be summarized as follows:

---

[12]W. Bruce Evans, Franklin University Staff Office, in a grant proposal to the Columbus Foundation, 4 May, 1983.

[13]Richard M. Cheski, State Librarian, to Allyn Ehrhardt, Director of FL, 26 April 1983.

1. One reason to do so is to comply with one of the standards prepared by the College Library Standards Committee and approved by the ACRL Board of Directors in 1986.

> The extent of resource sharing through formal cooperative arrangements among libraries should be recognized...as follows:
>
> Number of items borrowed from a nearby library with a formal resource sharing arrangement in effect.[14]

While the Franklin Library kept gross loan statistics, it had not maintained records of intralibrary loan numbers to and from CML. This study provides baseline numbers which can be used for comparison in future studies.

2. In past years, FL and CML had informally contacted each other when making decisions about major purchases. Because this study identified loans in thirty-eight subparts of the Dewey classification scheme, the identification of complementary collection strengths will further improve materials purchase decisions.

3. While specific patron types were not examined, the actual tracking of the loans to and from each organization will provide information as to whether one entity is benefitting significantly more than the other.

---

[14]Jacquelyn M. Morris, "Standards for College Libraries, 1986" Research Libraries News, 70 (March 1986): 193.

4. This initial formal recording of loan transactions should serve as one source of information for examining future cooperative efforts, such as placing serials online.

5. As previously mentioned, the Council on Library Resources has been a continuous advocate for the subjects of access and resource sharing.[15]

In their 1990 book regarding research opportunities for academic libraries, Mary Jo Lynch and Authur Young felt so strongly about one of the Council's 1985 statements that they republished six of the pages as an appendix. Of particular interest to this FL/CML study is the following paragraph:

> Multi-institutional operations. Formal library cooperatives and library service organizations have increased in number and influence, but there has been little reliable effort to assess the relationships between the forms of the organizations and the effectiveness of their programs.[16]

This study speaks partially to that research need by documenting the relationship between Franklin and the CML, and providing details of the

---

[15]Council on Library Resources, Annual Report, 1985, 13.

[16]Council on Library Resources, "Twenty-Ninth Annual Report, 1985," in Academic Libraries: Research Perspectives, ed. Mary Jo Lynch and Arthur Young (Chicago: American Library Association, 1990), 245.

intralibrary loan relationship over a four-month period.

## Limitations of the Study

The findings of this study are limited to the Franklin University Library and the Columbus Metropolitan Library system and may or may not be generalizable to all multi-institutional cooperative arrangements, which differ in size and nature of the users and collections.

## Definitions of Terms

The Library Data Collection Handbook published by the American Library Association has two definitions which are relevant to this study.[17]

> 1. INTERLIBRARY LOAN (ILL): According to the National Interlibrary Loan Code, 1980, an interlibrary loan is a transaction in which library materials , or a copy of the material is made available by one library to another upon request. The libraries involved in interlibrary loan are not under the same administration.
>
> 2. INTRALIBRARY LOAN: A loan made from one library (or one branch) to another within the same library system.

Part of each of these definitions is applicable to the FL/CML relationship. Each library is under a totally separate and distinct administration. By contractual arrangements and mutual cooperation, their cataloged holdings are on one common

---

[17]Mary Jo Lynch, ed. Library Data Collection Handbook (Chicago: American Library Association National Center of Education Statistics, 1981) 160.

online public access computer system. They are both on one common patron circulation system known as the "Discovery System."

## CHAPTER II

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Information about cooperative relationships can be examined in terms of pre- and post-1980, the time that automated technology was being seriously introduced at the individual library level. "Before 1981, Library Literature...did not even have an entry for microcomputers."[18]

Literature regarding cooperation between types of libraries was being published at least as early as 1940. In his annotated bibliography, Ralph Stenstrom cited references to early efforts at cooperation between academic and other libraries such as the following:

1. In New York State (1949), there was a proposal for a union catalog between public, school, and research libraries.[19]
2. A cooperative book fair program in 1959 was held by the public and college libraries in the area of the Faulkner-Van Buren Regional Library in Arkansas.[20]

---

[18]Ernest L. Boyer, College: The Undergraduate Experience in America (New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987), 166.

[19]Ralph H. Stenstrom, Cooperation Between Types of Libraries 1940-1968: An Annotated Bibliography (Chicago: Illinois State Library, American Library Association, 1970), 29.

[20]Ibid., 68.

3. A meeting (1967) of the members of the Northeast Wisconsin Intertype Libraries (NEWIL) was held to discuss joint use and sharing of audio-visual materials. These cooperative projects were to cover college, public, university and school libraries in a common program.

It appears that these early efforts were tentatively expressed, involved only the library staff, and when technology was mentioned it was a teletype.[21]

By 1977, the R.R. Bowker Company had published an entire book on the subject, Multitype Library Cooperation.[22] In the chapter dealing with possible benefits of cooperation to the small academic library, one sees the beginning of the dual promotion of the expectations of technology and the allied reasons for being in a cooperative effort:

> Technology will bring about a greater emphasis upon local arrangements that will have major implications for the small academic library. This fact, however, does not disclose the advantage to the small academic library of joining a multitype library network--that of having resources of many libraries easily accessible to meet unusual needs.[23]

Hamilton, the editor, also raises the question of overuse of the large library's holdings and whether the large library

---

[21]Ibid., 112.

[22]Beth A. Hamilton and William B. Ernst, eds. Multitype Library Cooperation (New York: R.R. Bowker, 1977)

[23]Ibid., 154.

benefits by participating. In a 1975 study which reported loan activity, one of the small libraries in the LIBRAS system loaned 575 books within the system while it borrowed only 407.[24] This result is of interest when compared to the Franklin/CML study, the results of which show Franklin loaning about six books for each one borrowed. This is covered in more detail in the "Data Analysis" section of this paper. The LIBRAS study was the only one found in which the investigators engaged in some type of enumeration process, however, the author did not outline the research methodology.

The final chapter of Multitype Library Cooperation contains comments now appearing prophetic of the "Reagan years" to follow, concerning the impact of federal funding on cooperative efforts.

> The majority of multitype activities are now funded by federal money through LSCA grants administered by state library agencies. While the projects supported in this fashion have been firmly accepted as a way of life on the library scene, the end of each grant period evinces a flurry of uncertainty for the future... Foundation support has been attracted in some instances, but mainly for projects that are innovative in nature and that can be widely adapted, rather than for the underwriting of administrative expenses.[25]

Evidence of the continued pressure for sharing the resources of academic libraries is shown in a study of academic libraries in Illinois in 1982. The survey of 132

---

[24]Ibid., 152.

[25]Ibid., 178.

academic libraries found that while "almost all" of the respondents permitted the general public to use their facilities, totally unrestricted borrowing was comparatively rare.[26]

Thomas H. Ballard, a prolific writer, authored a book in 1986 which was a castigation of what he felt was the waste of resources and efforts going into what he described as "larger units of service" or "multitype" library systems.[27] Because of its recent publication, and the relevancy of its title, mention of this book and its key points have been included and related to the Franklin/CML relationship.

In the early part of his book, Ballard explains what he feels were the forces in the development of library systems and their rationales. One such force was the Minimum Standards, adopted by ALA in 1966. As seen below, ALA did advocate a relationship between public and academic libraries.

> The concept of library systems is not limited to public libraries in a natural trade area working together. School and acadmic libraries, and those special libraries serving industry, have their appropriate role to play in systems dedicated to the task of making adequate resources available to all the people. The systems, in turn, reach out to a wider world, drawing on even greater and more specialized resources offered by state and federal agencies. In a well-organized structure of library service, the reader in smaller, more remote places will have access not only to all books and

---

[26]Herbert Goldhor, "Results of a Survey of Illinois Academic Libraries Affiliated with ILLINET," in Illinois Libraries Report No. 5 (Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, 1982), ERIC ED 226 736.

[27]Ballard, Failure of Resource Sharing in Public Libraries, 3.

materials in his region, but beyond that to the resources of the state and of the nation.[28]

Ballard's challenge of the proliferation of "multitype systems" is because of his concern about costs of providing a method of access which he feels ignores facts which have been proven in the past.

> An extended and unbroken string of user studies for over fifty years has established at least four important facts about public library service: (1) there is an inverse relationship between distance and library usage that we have never been able to change; (2) an adult's likelihood of becoming a library user depends primarily on the person's level of educational attainment, which is not within the control of the public library; (3) for the great majority of adults and almost all children, the nearest library agency to the home is the only one that will be used regardless of collection size; and (4) a patron's use of a public library agency is virtually limited to selection from the books on the shelf at the time of the visit.
>
> .....
>
> It should be obvious that the terms under which most patrons will use public libraries are not being addressed by the enhancements being offered. We offer patrons the state network, and they want access to a larger browsing collection. We are spending millions of dollars to provide services that patrons have been passively rejecting for as long as we had data about their behavior. Does this make sense?[29]

As the "Data Analysis" section of this paper will indicate, it appears that an increasing number of the public in central Ohio are willing to borrow books from the Franklin collection which they have seen only via a computer screen.

---

[28]American Library Association, "Minimum Standards," in Ballard, Failure of Resource Sharing in Public Libraries, 13.

[29]Ballard, Failure of Resource Sharing in Public Libraries, 273.

While Mr. Ballard might argue that the money could have been spent more effectively in other areas, the cost of providing the technology was obtained from private sources, as noted earlier, and did not represent a cost to CML or the public.

Evidence of the availability of technology and the impact on new levels of library cooperation was reported in 1989 in Library Technology Reports. A summary of research done by Information Consultants, Inc. of Washington, D.C. indicated that there were at least twenty-three profit-motivated businesses with multi-user access systems for sale. Even at that time, some of the systems had the capability of handling serials as well as monograph collections.[30]

One of these systems which seems to be very sophisticated in its capabilities and which has received much publicity in the literature is the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries, (CARL).

> CARL was formed in 1974 to seek collaborative solutions to common problems and resource sharing. What has happened in Colorado through CARL is a good model for other states, because the system was established within existing library appropriations and in a state that is not known for its generosity to higher education or libraries. System development could have occurred more quickly with supplementary funding, but the most serious barriers were political rather than economic... Today and in the future, the emphasis must be on access, not ownership.[31]

---

[30]Richard W. Boss and Susan B. Harrison, "The Online Patron Access Catalog: The Keystone in Library Automation," Library Technology Reports 25 (September-October 1989): 635, 644.

[31]Patricia Senn Breivik and Ward Shaw, "Libraries Prepare for an Information Age," Educational Record 70 (1 Winter 1989): 14.

One of the relevant characteristics of the CARL system is that one of the six institutions is the Denver Public Library along with five different academic libraries in the state. While their catalogs are not merged, any patron at any location has computer access to the holdings of any of the participating institutions. In addition, it appears that the six members of the CARL System can electronically recognize patron cards of the others and that they are on a common circulation system without having totally merged their catalogs. Ms. Breivik and Mr. Shaw, CARL's executive director, have written many articles about the advancements of CARL, however, it does not seem that there have been any published studies about their interlibrary loan use rate.

Seeking other studies which would specifically apply to this study, a letter was written to the Council on Library Resources. The response from the Administrative Assistant indicated that the CLR had not participated in any studies of the type being conducted.[32]

A good summary work about library cooperation and networks is a book of that title by Anne Woodsworth.[33] Of particular interest are her chapters on "Defining Library Networks," "Behavioral Issues," "Barriers, Failures and

---

[32]Elden B. Timmer, Administrative Assistant with Council on Library Resources, letter to James Maxwell dated April 9, 1991.

[33]Anne Woodsworth, Library Cooperation and Networks: A Basic Reader (New York: Neal Schuman, 1991).

Alternatives," and the extensive "Bibliography."[34] She discusses the issues of cooperation from the viewpoints of all types of libraries and quotes extensively from other authors.

Last, it seems appropriate to quote a summarizing statement from the book by Breivik and Gee.

> Campuses wishing to automate library operations have four basic options:
>
> * develop a stand-alone library system
> * develop a library system utilizing hardware in a campus computer center
> * develop a system in conjunction with other libraries
> * buy a ready-made (turnkey) system from a vendor
>
> ... Of the four basic options available, only the third--cooperation with other libraries--guarantees increased access.[35]

By becoming part of an existing automated system, the Franklin library has provided that increased access.

---

[34]Ibid., 1, 40, 127, 136.

[35]Breivik and Gee, Information Literacy, 124.

## CHAPTER III

## METHODOLOGY

Intralibrary loan activity between Franklin University Library and the Columbus Metropolitan Library was analyzed during the months of June, July, September and October, 1991. The objective was to collect data in two different school trimesters.

All of Franklin's books are in the automated catalog. CML also catalogs all of Franklin's new purchases. The system permits online searching by patrons by subject, author, title or Dewey call number.

There is one circulation system which covers all patrons for both libraries. All user cards are identical and there has not been any effort to code Franklin students. This means that it was not possible to identify those situations where a Franklin student may have gone to a CML branch location and requested an intralibrary loan for a book owned by Franklin. If future analysis indicates that a disproportionate number of Franklin loans are going to a few CML branch locations, it might suggest a further special study to identify borrower profiles at those locations.

The automated loan system has a built-in queing feature which:

--monitors total loan activity at each location,

--provides for major CML locations to be the first level of support for other locations,

--finally comes to a specific item request which is owned by only one location.

For Franklin, it was expected that there would be a greater number of loan requests in the 600 section and in the 300s for those sections containing books about economics, labor law and other business-related aspects.

At the recommendation of the Director at Franklin, the Dewey classification scheme was divided into thirty-eight classifications ranges, feeling that this grouping would be manageable as well as informative.

The following ranges were designated in advance as being those which contain "business books" and which were expected to have the highest levels of activity:

The "Business Books" categories

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| .001 | through | .006 |
| 330.000 | through | 339.999 |
| 343.000 | through | 344.999 |
| 346.000 | through | 346.999 |
| 380.000 | through | 389.999 |
| 650.000 | through | 650.999 |
| 651.000 | through | 651.999 |
| 657.000 | through | 657.999 |
| 658.000 | through | 658.999 |
| 659.000 | through | 659.999 |

Data were collected in the following manner: In order to minimize the influence of lower student attendance during the summer, intralibrary loan transactions were tallied during two school trimesters in 1991: June-July and September-October.

Requests for Franklin books come in via the computer system with call numbers and the locations to which they are to be sent. Patron names are not shown at the lending end of the system and confidentiality is not an issue. Books which came into Franklin to fill borrowing requests were counted and tallied against a sheet with the data collection scheme before being matched with patron cards. Data were collected on a daily basis and entered into a computer spreadsheet.

## CHAPTER IV

## DATA ANALYSIS

The ratio of books being loaned into the system, versus books being borrowed and the percentage of the transactions related to "business books" are provided in numerical summaries in Figures 1 and 2.

| | June | July | September | October | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Books loaned from Franklin to the CML system | 348 | 466 | 457 | 508 | 1779 |
| Books borrowed from the CML system and charged out to Franklin patrons | 86 | 48 | 39 | 84 | 257 |
| Ratio of books loaned to books borrowed | 4.0 to 1 | 9.7 to 1 | 11.7 to 1 | 6.0 to 1 | 6.9 to 1 |

**FIGURE 1**
**Numerical summary and ratios of the total number of books borrowed and loaned over a four-month period in the Franklin University study in 1991**

Figure 2 provides a summary of totals for all books borrowed and loaned by month over the four-month period, and the corresponding numbers for those borrowed from the areas defined as "business books."

| | June | July | September | October | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total number of books borrowed | 86 | 48 | 39 | 84 | 257 |
| Number identified as "business books" | 19 | 10 | 6 | 19 | 54 |
| "Business books" as a percentage of books borrowed | 22.09 | 20.83 | 15.38 | 22.62 | 21.01 |
| Number of books loaned | 348 | 466 | 457 | 508 | 1779 |
| Number identified as"business books" | 148 | 163 | 183 | 179 | 673 |
| "Business books" as a percentage of books loaned | 42.53 | 34.98 | 40.04 | 35.24 | 37.83 |

**FIGURE 2**
**Summary totals of all books loaned and borrowed and the corresponding "business" percentage**

Franklin continued to conduct its own in-house circulation activities, in addition to the intra-loans to CML. To show the significance of the lending activity, Figure 3 summarizes and compares the total charge-out activity at Franklin and the intralibrary loans being made to CML during the study.

| | JUNE | JULY | SEPTEMBER | OCTOBER | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Franklin books charged to patrons | 2155 | 2694 | 2194 | 2980 | 10023 |
| Books borrowed from CML and charged out at Franklin | 86 | 48 | 39 | 84 | 257 |
| Total number of books charged out at Franklin | 2241 | 2742 | 2233 | 3064 | 10280 |
| | | | | | |
| Franklin books loaned to CML | 348 | 466 | 457 | 508 | 1779 |
| Loans to CML as a percentage of total books charged out | 15.53 | 16.99 | 20.47 | 16.58 | 17.31 |

**FIGURE 3**
**A summary and comparison of books being charged out at the Franklin circulation desk and those loaned to CML**

Findings derived from Figures 1, 2 and 3 may be summarized as follows:

1. To the extent of almost seven-to-one, Franklin was loaning a greater number of books into the system than "in-house" patrons were borrowing from the CML collection.

   Possible reasons for this result are:

   a. The Main location of the CML system is just three city blocks away from the Franklin library. When a Franklin student identifies a needed book at the Main branch of CML, he might walk to that location instead of waiting two or three days for delivery of a borrowing request.

   b. If a CML book is owned by a branch location distant from where the student lives, it is possible that a loan request for the book could be delivered to a second CML branch close to the student's home. In this scenario, the transaction would not show in Franklin's borrowing numbers.

   c. Some Franklin students attend class only once each week. Therefore they may be requesting materials from Franklin and directing a pick-up location closer to their homes.

d. With 22 locations serving 1.3 million citizens in the county, the CML system has far larger demands in all areas than does Franklin.

2. During the four-month period of the study, 42.53 percent represented the highest percentage of "business books" to totally loaned books.

While the absolute number of loaned "business books" continued to increase, it appears that the rate of increase for other areas of the collection may be equal to or even greater than the "business books" loan rate.

3. While there was not an anticipated percentage of borrowings, the 21.01 percent of "business books" which in-house Franklin patrons borrowed from the CML collection is of interest.

At least two distinct possibilities exist in this area of use.

One could be that some subject demands by Franklin students are constantly in excess of the quantity capability of the Franklin collection. For instance, it is suggested that some computer subject books such as those for introductions to "UNIX" and "C" language are constantly checked out. The same is thought to be true for some particular authors who write in the field of quality control.

A second possibility is that there are related subject fields which just may not be adequately represented in the Franklin collection.

A separate study by title and/or MARC record subject codes would have to be made to determine the exact nature of this demand.

4. The responsibility of filling the daily intraloan requests from CML was continuing to grow and become an increasingly significant portion of Franklin's total circulation activity.

While data were not tracked by borrowing location, informal observations by the Franklin staff indicate that several of the CML locations seem to be dominant in the number of books requested. If this was due to the skill and cooperation of their particular staff members, it might be expected that demand will continue to grow as patrons at other locations become increasingly aware of the ability to borrow Franklin's books through the system.

Figure 4 shows the same total numbers for the four-month period, but expresses by Dewey classification, with the previously noted exceptions concerning the treatment of juvenile literature, fiction and biographies.

| | Borrowed | % of total | Loaned | % of total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Juvenile | 20 | 7.78 | N/A | N/A |
| 000 | 5 | 1.95 | 53 | 2.98 |
| 100 | 16 | 6.23 | 134 | 7.53 |
| 200 | 3 | 1.17 | 32 | 1.80 |
| 300 | 45 | 17.51 | 568 | 31.93 |
| 400 | 3 | 1.17 | 6 | .34 |
| 500 | 4 | 1.55 | 76 | 4.27 |
| 600 | 77 | 29.96 | 687 | 38.62 |
| 700 | 20 | 7.78 | 74 | 4.16 |
| 800 and fiction | 47 | 18.29 | 69 | 3.87 |
| 900 and bibliography | 17 | 6.61 | 80 | 4.50 |
| TOTAL | 257 | 100.00 | 1779 | 100.00 |

**FIGURE 4**
**Totals by Dewey Classification**

Several observations are of interest when the data are viewed in this manner.

1. The 687 books loaned from the "600" classification are not surprising in that a substantial portion (435) were "business books."

However, the 568 books from the 300 classification are of a much different composition. Only 194 (34.2%) of these are "business books." This could mean that the social sciences department at CML may want to examine the strength of its collection in the 300-309 range and the 370-379 range. Prior to the 1991 addition of new space to the Main CML location, there was a number of years when it did not have adequate space and were not adding to parts of the collection.

2. In the case of Franklin, observations regarding what might be happening in the 600 classification have already been offered. With the exception of the 300s and 800s, the other numbers are so small it is difficult to formulate any conclusion other than that it is to be expected that CML's collection will have a greater number of desired books which are not present in the Franklin collection.

The borrowing by Franklin in the 300s is of interest in those ranges determined to be "non-business." Since CML is borrowing from Franklin at a far greater rate in these areas, perhaps the question needs to be posed regarding the strength of the total combined collections in these areas within the 300s scheme.

The only other area of relatively heavy use of borrowing by Franklin was in the combined "fiction" and 800s range. Because "fiction" and "literature" were combined, it is not possible to determine if this demand is equal between the two, or composed largely of a demand for popular fiction. With the exception of owning several hundred popular fiction titles in paperback, Franklin does not have a fiction collection.

3. It also has to be remembered that if an identical title is owned by several locations, it is the computer system which decides the lending location, based upon the total lending being done by any one location each day.

4. Finally, one must conclude, if it is not Franklin students who are borrowing these labor history and accounting books, then the citizens of Columbus are benefitting by the addition of the Franklin collection to the CML computer catalog.[36]

---

[36]Allyn Ehrhardt, Director of the Franklin University Library, in interviews with James Maxwell in 1991 and 1992.

## CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Literature regarding the methods of library cooperation,[37] or the wisdom of cooperation,[38] is still divergent in its views. The lending/borrowing results between Franklin and CML have been surprising to the extent that Franklin is lending substantially more than it is borrowing. Additionally, while the absolute number of "business books" being loaned is significant, the number of non-business books being loaned by Franklin is even more so.

The Director of the Franklin Library is not at all displeased about the number of books being loaned into the system for three reasons:

1. It has not yet been proven, nor is it important, that some of the loans may be convenience transfers by Franklin students to CML locations closer to their residence or place of work.

2. This is an undergraduate college, not a research library. Since the materials have been purchased, it is rewarding to see them being used.

3. Having Franklin University's name appear many times each day on computer screens

---

[37]Anne Woodsworth, Library Cooperation, 2.

[38]Thomas H. Ballard, Failure of Resource Sharing in Public Libraries, 273.

throughout the CML system is an excellent public relations 'tool.'[39]

The results of the relationship to date are expected to foster further areas of cooperation between the Franklin library and the CML. It is also believed that the current success is going to encourage one or more independent public suburban library systems and perhaps one or more area colleges to merge their catalogs and circulation systems with those of CML and Franklin.[40]

In addition to providing greater depth and breadth of selection for the citizens of central Ohio, new participants might also provide some economies of scale in supporting the system; however, this would require a specific study for substantiation. At any rate, the current merger certainly appears to be successful for the two libraries already involved.

---

[39]Allyn Ehrhardt, Director of the Franklin University Library, in interviews with James Maxwell in 1991 and 1992.

[40]Ibid.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Library Association. "Minimum Standards." In The Failure of Resource Sharing in Public Libraries and Alternative Strategies for Service, Thomas H. Ballard, 13-14. Chicago: American Library Association, 1986.

Ballard, Thomas H. The Failure of Resource Sharing in Public Libraries and Alternative Strategies for Service. Chicago: American Library Association, 1986.

Black, Larry D., to Allyn Ehrhardt, 29 April, 1983. Unpublished letter from the Director of the Columbus Metropolitan Library to the Director of the Franklin University Library, regarding the original cooperation proposal. In the possession of Allyn Ehrhardt at Franklin University, Columbus, Ohio.

Boyer, Ernest L. College : The Undergraduate Experience in America. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Harper & Row, 1987.

Breivik, Patricia Senn and E. Gordon Gee. Information Literacy: Revolution in the Library. New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan, 1990.

Breivik, Patricia Senn and Ward Shaw. "Libraries Prepare for an Information Age." Educational Record 70 (Winter 1989): 12-19.

Bunte, Frederic J. to Tullia Hamilton, 4 May 1983. Letter from the President of Franklin University, accompanying a grant request to The Columbus Foundation. In possession of Allyn Ehrhardt at Franklin University Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Cheski, Richard M. to Allyn Ehrhardt, 26 April 1983. Letter from the Director of the Library of the State of Ohio. Copy in the possession of Allyn Ehrhardt at Franklin University Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Columbus Metropolitan Library. 1991 Annual Report. Columbus, Ohio.

Council on Library Resources. "Twenty-Ninth Annual Report, 1985." In Academic Libraries: Research Perspectives, ed. Mary Jo Lynch and Arthur Young, 241-247. Chicago: American Library Association, 1990.

Council on Library Resources, Inc. Twenty-Ninth Annual Report/1985; Thirty-Third Annual Report/1989; Thirty-Fourth Annual Report/1990. Washington, D.C.

Ehrhardt, Allyn, Director of Franklin University Library. Letter dated Dec. 6, 1990 to Tullia Hamilton of the Columbus Foundation regarding the formation of the relationship between the Franklin University Library and the Columbus Metropolitan Library. Columbus, Ohio.

Ehrhardt, Allyn, Director of Franklin University Library. Various interviews by James Maxwell in 1991 and 1992. Columbus, Ohio.

Evans, W. Bruce to the Columbus Foundation, 4 May 1983. A grant request from the Vice President of University Advancement to the Columbus Foundation. In the possession of Allyn Ehrhart at the Franklin University Library.

Goldhor, Herbert. "Results of a Survey of Illinois Academic Libraries Affiliated with ILLINET." Illinois Libraries Report No. 5. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1982, ERIC, ED 226 736.

Hamilton, Beth A. and William B. Ernst, ed. Multitype Library Cooperation. New York: R.R. Bowker, 1977.

Lynch, Mary Jo, ed. Library Data Collections Handbook. Chicago: American Library Association, National Center for Education Statistics, 1981.

Morris, Jacqueline M., Chairman, ACRL Board of Directors. "Standards for College Libraries, 1986." College & Research Libraries News 70 (March 1986): 189-200.

Stenstrom, Ralph H. Cooperation Between Types of Libraries 1940-1968: An Annotated Bibliography. Chicago: Illinois State Library, American Library Association, 1970.

Timmer, Ellen B., Administrative Assistant with Council on Library Resources. Letter to James Maxwell dated April 9, 1991.

Whitlatch, Jo Bell. "Access Services." Chap. in Academic Libraries: Research Perspectives, ed. Mary Jo Lynch and Arthur Young. 67-105. Chicago: American Library Association, 1990.

Woodsworth, Anne. Library Cooperation and Networks: A Basic Reader. New York: Neal-Schuman, 1991.